

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES**

October 13, 2020

MEETING CONVENED: 7:21 p.m. GoToMeeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair George Irvine, Beth Chajes, MaryClare Matsumoto, Robyn O'Halloran

ABSENT: Bob McDowell, Helga Huntley, Sheila Smith

STAFF: Nichol Scheld, Administrative Professional I
Jayme Gravell, Chief Communications Officer
Jeff Martindale, Chief Purchasing & Personnel Officer

Dr. Irvine called the meeting to order at 7:21 p.m.

(Secretary's Note: Due to a last-minute cancellation, there was no quorum, so the Commission was unable to vote or provide direction. City staff provided the intended update and the meeting adjourned early.)

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 15, 2020:** None

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

3. **STRAW RESOLUTION UPDATE – JAYME GRAVELL AND JEFF MARTINDALE**

Mr. Martindale thanked the Commission for continuing the meeting and revealed the Straw Resolution was tentatively scheduled for November 9th, 2020. He noted if the meeting had been pushed, the CAC would not have had the opportunity to discuss the resolution before it was presented to Council. He requested that a member of the CAC attend the virtual meeting to offer a comment on the resolution which had been a project since June 2019. He explained Ms. Bensley was drafting the resolution and expected it would be straight forward. He reiterated the resolution was slated for the November 9th Council meeting and thanked the CAC for their support and help.

4. **STRAW REDUCTION FLYER DISTRIBUTION PLAN – JAYME GRAVELL AND JEFF MARTINDALE**

Dr. Irvine asked how and when the flyers would be distributed. Mr. Martindale hoped to have the flyers completed at the time the resolution passed so Council could have an example of the secondary educational piece. He continued that staff had met their obligations in terms of the coordinated effort in creating the flyer and bringing the resolution to fruition so the distribution of the flyers would be the Commission's responsibility.

Ms. Gravell echoed Mr. Martindale's comments on distribution and referred to the last CAC meeting she attended where she shared a Vistaprint link with the group. She understood that the Commission would select the sizes, order the printing, and handle the distribution. She emphasized that City staff did not have the availability to distribute the flyers and explain the history of the resolution to

restaurants or provide additional education. She expected that the CAC would divide the distribution efforts among the members and deliver them to restaurants within the City.

Dr. Irvine anticipated that Council would have questions impact of the resolution and believed the flyer and social media could assist. He asked Ms. Gravell if the Communications Department would help distribute the flyers electronically. Ms. Gravell confirmed and reminded the CAC about the discussion on having a digital copy of the flyer available on the City's site for download. She reiterated the flyer would be available on the website but that the CAC would be responsible for delivering hard copies to the restaurants. Dr. Irvine did not suspect the CAC would deliver the flyers during the pandemic and wanted to push the electronic distribution before the physical distribution. He asked if there was a restaurant association just for Newark restaurants because he only knew of a Delaware association. Ms. Gravell confirmed but said the association did not include every Newark restaurant and recalled only five or six people at the meeting with the Mayor and only represented the so-called major restaurants. She repeated that the association did not include every Newark restaurant and believed the CAC would want to focus more on the smaller take-out services that provided plastic straws. She noted that straws were available at Grain by request and offered to make an introduction to the restaurant association to see if they could assist in distribution. Mr. Martindale suggested the CAC also go through The Newark Partnership (TNP), which was made up of governmental, non-profit, and business members which could have a larger listing of smaller restaurants than the restaurant association. Ms. Gravell explained that TNP would not share their contact outside of the organization but might be open to sharing the CAC's flyers in a newsletter.

Dr. Irvine believed the first step was to create a digital flyer and asked if Ms. Gravell's group could complete the task and Ms. Gravell confirmed. Dr. Irvine stated that City staff would not print or distribute the physical flyers and Ms. Gravell confirmed that the flyers were complete and approved by the CAC but explained they could not be distributed without Council approval. Ms. Gravell continued that once the resolution was in place, staff could put the flyers online and distribute a download link via social media. She reiterated that the physical prints and distribution would be done by the CAC members unless the restaurants chose to buy their own cardstock for self-printing. Mr. Martindale supported Dr. Irvine's suggestion that the physical flyers might have to wait until after the pandemic lifted. He referred to the last minutes where Dr. Huntley shared a conversation with Klondike Kate's where she learned there was a Statewide restriction on what restaurants could have on tabletops. He supported Dr. Irvine's suggestion that digital distribution should be the first step. Dr. Irvine offered to reach out to TNP after Council passed the resolution and also offered to send the flyers to the Delaware Restaurant Association. He noted the pdf flyer could be used for educational purposes for staff and customers, and restaurants could choose their own display format. He wanted to emphasize the digital format and social media aspects and encouraged Ms. Gravell to distribute the flyers digitally throughout all City platforms. Ms. Gravell confirmed that once Council approved the resolution, the flyers would be ready to distribute unless the CAC had revisions. Dr. Irvine asked Ms. Gravell to send the flyers to Ms. Scheld so they could be forwarded to the CAC members. Ms. Gravell reminded there were three flyers that had the same information with different backgrounds and confirmed she would send them to Ms. Scheld. Dr. Irvine believed Dr. Huntley could include the flyers as part of the December article on sustainability as an example of sustainability in action for governance and public/private partnership.

Ms. Matsumoto asked what the ordinance would say, and Dr. Irvine corrected that it was a resolution. Mr. Martindale replied that Ms. Bensley was crafting the resolution and expected it would be completed by the end of the month. He noted it would be posted to the Council agenda a week in advance of being presented to Council and would be available on November 2nd. Mr. Martindale explained that Ms. Bensley had all of the pertinent background information on the resolution and would perform her

own research for the draft. Dr. Irvine believed the CAC could strengthen the resolution if it was made available in advance and noted the members provided stats and data to staff which was then shared with Ms. Bensley. Dr. Irvine educated Ms. Matsumoto on the language of a resolution and suspected the City Solicitor would also be included in the drafting measures. Ms. Matsumoto wondered if distributing the flyers via the Free Library pick-up service was an option and offered to reach out to the library. Dr. Irvine supported the idea and pointed that the conversation returned to physical prints and suggested the flyer could also be included in the monthly electric bill by Public Works. Ms. Matsumoto presumed the resolution would pass in November and the CAC could discuss distribution on the November agenda. Dr. Irvine said he would try to attend the virtual meeting to answer any potential questions from Council. Ms. Chajes suggested the students who first presented the straw issue to the CAC should be made aware that the resolution was going before Council and Dr. Irvine agreed. Ms. Chajes suggested that Tammy Lunsford could reach out to the students. Dr. Irvine noted that the students were now juniors at Newark Charter and offered to contact Ms. Lunsford.

Dr. Irvine thanked Ms. Gravell and Mr. Martindale for their efforts. Mr. Martindale stated he would be available for further staff questions and Ms. Gravell said she would send Ms. Scheld the flyer proofs for distribution. She continued that the Communications Department created the utility bill newsletter and shared that the distribution was scheduled a month in advance so staff would have to word the newsletter accordingly. Dr. Irvine was fine with including the flyer in the December bill, as well. Ms. Gravell assumed staff would shrink the flyer and include it in the existing newsletter. Dr. Irvine thanked Ms. Gravell.

5. **CURTIS MILL PLANTING UPDATE**
6. **FLOODING AND RIPARIAN BUFFER EDUCATION**
7. **ANTI-IDLING AND PUBLIC EDUCATION UPDATE**
8. **MONTHLY CONSERVATION ARTICLE WITH THE NEWARK POST**
9. **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORTS**
10. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

Dr. Irvine asked Ms. Scheld if the Council meeting on November 9th was at 7pm and she confirmed. He asked if the link would be on the City website and she confirmed. Ms. Scheld shared a copy of a past resolution in the chat function as an example and reiterated that the resolutions were always posted to the City's website. Dr. Irvine noted that the members presenting the remainder of the agenda items were not in attendance and made the motion to adjourn because no further action could be taken without a quorum. He asked if Ms. O'Halloran wanted to address anti-idling and she offered to email her findings. Dr. Irvine repeated the motion to adjourn and asked Ms. Scheld to roll the agenda items into November and noted it was important to have a quorum when the Commission was down two members. He asked if there were any other topics to discuss.

Ms. Matsumoto revealed that she attended the Planning Area 7 workshop which included the properties of an applicant who wanted to be connected to the City's utilities. She also attended the Planning Commission meeting and said she spoke against expanding the planning area because there was no sidewalk or bus line connecting the area to the City and the bike lane ended where the new area began.

She reported that the vote was tied 3:3 and assumed it would still be brought to Council because she guessed that the Planning Commission could still give Council recommendations. She thought that sidewalks were a part of a sustainable Newark and the infrastructure should be in place first. She believed the Sustainability Plan was clear on multi-modal transportation. She continued that the Plan for Planning committee with three to four residents at large was presented to Council and asked Ms. O'Halloran to reach out for applicants to fill the younger demographic. Ms. O'Halloran confirmed that she would reach out to potential candidates. Ms. Matsumoto noted the Planning Commission wanted the Steering Committee to begin meeting in November and thought the application process was extensive.

Dr. Irvine noted the Planning Commission was tied 3:3 on Planning Area 7 and asked when it would come before Council. Ms. Matsumoto replied that she did not know but believed her Councilperson would let her know. Ms. Scheld repeated that Council agendas were published on week in advance. Dr. Irvine agreed with Ms. Matsumoto's view of Planning Area 7 and continued that when land was added without a close analysis of the long-term financial impacts of the annexation, it did not pay off in the long term. He noted the landowner benefitted because it was easier to sell homes when the infrastructure was promised by the City and admitted there were concerns about whether taxes covered the long term. He did not think the annexation made sense from a conservation or sustainability perspective if the Sustainability Plan addressed transportation, land use, and smart growth. He expressed interest in addressing the issue as a member of the public and chair of the CAC. He admitted the CAC did not have input on Planning Area 7 but wanted to speak his mind at the Council meeting and suggested the rest of the members also speak because it was not good public policy for the City. Ms. Scheld suggested the discussion should not continue because it was not a listed agenda item and Dr. Irvine said it was covered under Old/New Business. He noted he requested additional items before the meeting was officially called and emphasized the meeting was not officially adjourned.

Dr. Irvine suggested that Ms. Matsumoto create a recommendation for the CAC to have a path forward. Ms. Matsumoto was unsure that she could and pointed that she had spoken out for all of her reasons as a resident. She reiterated her concern that the area was not connected to the City. She did not know how the CAC could make a resolution but noted that Mr. Hurd mentioned the CAC would consider how the Plan met the Sustainability Plan. She assumed that the CAC could offer a recommendation after the Plan was completed. Dr. Irvine asked if she was speaking about the Plan for Planning as opposed to Planning Area 7 and Ms. Matsumoto confirmed and was sure the issue of the annexation was not over. Dr. Irvine agreed and asked Ms. Scheld to add the topic to the November agenda because he wanted to discuss the issue as the Conservation Advisory Commission to prepare for when it came before Council. He noted the CAC did not have a formal role in the land use review process, but he wanted the CAC to have a voice in the public comment section.

11. NEXT MEETING – NOVEMBER 10, 2020

MOTION BY DR. IRVINE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Nichol Scheld
Administrative Professional I

/ns